

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of October 14, 2008 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC §§ 102 & 103**

Claims 1, and 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,020,696 to Perry, et al. (hereinafter Perry). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary. Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry with reference to the Background section of the present invention.

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, Applicants have slightly modified the language Claim 1 to clearly differentiate the concept of "functional groups" based on the functions of the systems services from the concept of "user groups" based on different access privileges. As discussed herein, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments.

### **Aspects of Applicants' Invention**

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by amended Claim 1, is a method for presenting system services in customized views.

The method can include categorizing the system services into functional groups based on functions of the system services; establishing a plurality of system service profiles, each system service profile representing a customized subset of the system

services; detecting a request for the presentation of system services from a user; ascertaining an identity of the user and at least one computing device associated with the request; determining a privilege group associated with the user; determining at least one of said system service profiles corresponding to the user, the privilege group, and/or the at least one computing device; determining at least one system service to be displayed in accordance with the at least one determined system service profile; and displaying the determined at least one system service within a graphical user interface in an order based on the categorization. See, e.g., Specification, paragraphs [0028] to [0029] and [0033]; see also Figs. 2-4.

**The Claims Define Over The Prior Art**

It was asserted on page 7 of the Office Action that as indicated in col. 51, lines 3-35, Perry discloses that "each group may include one or more configured resources within the network, and the resources of each group may be related in some way," and further discusses an example wherein several groups could be created for Walmart network devices, wherein the resources are grouped based on location in the United States and users are given access to one or more groups. It was further asserted that therefore in Perry system services are categorized by functional groups and displayed to the user based on the categorization.

Col. 51, lines 3-35 of Perry reads as follows:

*Each group may include one or more configured resources (e.g., SONET paths, VATM interfaces, ATM PVCs) within the network device, and the resources in each group may be related in some way. For instance, a group may include resources configured by a particular provisioner. As another example, a group may include configured resources purchased by a particular customer. For instance, Walmart Corporation may be a customer of a network service provider and each network device resource paid for/subscribed to by Walmart may be included in a Walmart group. In addition, if Walmart subscribes to a larger number of configured resources, the network service provider may create several groups within the same*

*network device for Walmart, for example, Walmart-East may include network device resources associated with Walmart activities in the eastern half of the United States and Walmart-West may include network device resources associated with Walmart activities in the western half of the United States. In addition, the network service provider may create a Walmart-Total group including all configured resources within the network device paid for by Walmart. Various users may be given access to one or more groups. For example, a Walmart employee responsible for network service in the eastern half of the United States may be given access to only the Walmart-East group while another higher level Walmart employee is given access to both the Walmart-East and Walmart-West groups. In addition, the same group name may be used in multiple network devices to simplify tracking. Through profiles multiple users may be given access to the same or different groups of configured resources within each network device, and users may be given access to multiple groups of configured resources in different network devices.*

As can be clearly seen from this paragraph, the different groups (such as Walmart-East and Walmart-West groups) have nothing to do with the concept of "functional groups" (such as printer, e-mail, storage, and the like; see Specification, paragraph [0033]) in the sense of the present invention. Rather, the groups as described in the above-quoted paragraph refer to user groups, similar to the concept of the "privilege group" as recited in Claim 1 of the instant application. It is noted that in the present invention the categorization of the system services based on the functions of the system services does not affect what a user can view, but only how the system services are displayed within the graphical user interface (see, e.g., Figs. 3 and 4 of the instant application). Although Perry discloses that each group may include one or more configured resources within the network, Perry does not disclose that the different resources should be categorized into functional groups and displayed based on the categorization.

Accordingly, Perry fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claim 1, as amended. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 defines over the prior art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103 be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant believes that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicant requests that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Date: November 24, 2008

/Gregory A. Nelson/

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577

Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150

Customer No. 40987

Post Office Box 3188

West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

Telephone: (561) 653-5000